

REMARKS

Responsive to the Examiner's requirement, the text of the withdrawn claims is included herein.

Responsive to the requirement for restriction, applicant elects the Group I claims 1-3, 8 and 9.

Claim 1 has been amended to include a boss on the outside surface of each of the flanges. Accordingly, Claim 8 has been canceled.

The drawings have been objected to as not showing the grooves of Claim 9. The Examiner's attention is called to Figures 5 and 6 which show the groove 72 and which is discussed on page 7, lines 1-4. Accordingly, this objection should be withdrawn.

Claim 9 has been rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph as containing subject matter not described in the specification for the reasons set forth above, it is submitted that this ground of rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-3, 8 and 9 have been rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph since:

(c) Claim 1, line 7 since no structure for the passageway has been recited. Claim 1 has been amended to include a wall of the passageway.

(d) Claim 8, line 2, the point of reference is stated for "outer". Claim 8 has been incorporated into Claim 1 and Claim 1 has been amended to state that the outer surface is most remote from the filter medium.

and(c) No point of reference is used for "lower" in Claim 9. Claim 9 has been amended to state that the lower surface is adjacent the filter medium.

In view of the above, it is submitted that these grounds of rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-3 and 8 have been rejected under 35 USC 102 (b) over Stankowski. Stankowski does not disclose bosses on the flanges. Stankowski discloses legs which do not include ramps which allow the bosses to be inserted

into the slots 86 and 88. Accordingly, this ground of rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 9 has been rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) over Staankowski in view of Pall et al. Neither Stankowski nor Pall et al discloses or suggest including bosses on the flanges. Accordingly, this ground of rejection should be withdrawn.


Claims 1 and 3 have been rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) or Koelfgen in view of Briggs. Neither Koelfgen nor Briggs discloses or suggest including bosses on the flanges. Accordingly, this ground of rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 2 has been rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) over Koelfgen in view of Briggs and further in view of Swanson. None of Koelfgen, Briggs or Swanson discloses or suggest including bosses on the flanges. Accordingly, this ground of rejection should be withdrawn.

In view of the above, it is submitted that applicant's claims define patentable subject matter and a notice of allowance to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Paul J. Cook, (Registration No. 20,820)

Entegris Corporation  
129 Concord Road  
Billerica, MA 01821-4600  
Telephone (978) 436-6582  
Facsimile (978) 436-6739